DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 292 RC 004 182

AUTHOR	Adams, Darrell K.; And Others
TITLE	Minority Group - Governmental Agency Relations.
INSTITUTION	Denver Univ., Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Colorado Civil Rights Commission, Denver.
PUB DATE	66
NOTE	88p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.50
DESCRIPTORS	*Agencies, *Anglo Americans, Civil Rights, Community Agencies (Public), Disadvantaged Groups, *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), Federal Programs, Government Role, Minority Groups, *Negroes, *Spanish Americans, State Agencies
IDENTIFIERS	*Colorado

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this 1966 study was to explore the relationships between minority groups and selected governmental agencies in Colorado in order to determine if discrimination was practiced in the agencies. A 2-part study was designed. The first part was restricted to the Denver area and was structured to determine which governmental agencies should be studied in depth. Agencies selected for detailed study were public hospitals, police departments, and state employment offices. The second, or follow-up phase, attempted to examine in detail the nature and pattern of contacts between minority persons and the governmental agencies designated in the first part of the study. Some 344 Anglo Americans, Negroes, and Spanish Americans were interviewed, and it was found that city agencies were contacted most often, followed by federal agencies and then state agencies. It was concluded that some discriminatory conduct had been observed. The document is appended with information on procedures used in observing discrimination procedures and with answers to major queries regarding the report after its initial release. (TL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED037292

MINORITY GROUP - GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY RELATIONS

RESEARCH STUDY

RECEIVED
FEB 27 1970
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

Prepared By

DARRELL K. ADAMS

and

GEORGE E. BARDWELL

PART I

and

FRANK PLAUT

PART II

by special contract with the

COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

and

THE COLORADO ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TO THE U. S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

STATE OF COLORADO

JOHN A. LOVE, Governor

RC004182

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Introduction--

Part I-- 1

Appendix A-Part I-----------------------------------

Appendix B-Part I-----------------------------------

Consulting Committee Action------------------------ i

Introduction to Part II--------------------------- 29

Part II--- 33

Appendix A-Part II----------------------------------

Appendix B-Part II----------------------------------

MINORITY GROUP - GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY RELATIONS

PART I

Prepared By

DARRELL K. ADAMS

and

GEARGE E. BARDWELL

University of Denver

1966

Consulting Committee

Minority Group-Government Agency Relations Study

Dr. Robert Amundson, Professor of Sociology, Loretto Heights College, Denver, Colorado

James A. Atkins, Writer, 2720 Race Street, Denver, Colorado

Senator George Brown, Member, Colorado Advisory Committee to U. S. Civil Rights Commission

Dr. Edward Rose, Department of Sociology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Mrs. Connie Sisneros, Commissioner, Colorado Civil Rights Commission

Dr. Bernard Spilka, Department of Psychology, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado

Rabbi Joseph Goldman, Chairman, Colorado Advisory Committee, U.S. Civil Rights Commission

James F. Reynolds, Director, Colorado Civil Rights Commission

Ruth Steiner, Civil Rights Specialist, Colorado Civil Rights Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Purpose of the Study. 1

II. Methodology 5
  Design. 5
  Response rate 6
  Interviewer-subject matching. 6
  Sample composition. 12
  Interview 15

III. Results 16
  Agency evaluations obtained 16
  Frequency of contact. 16
  Agency ratings. 19
  Composite recommendations 27

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the Colorado legislature has provided funds for the Civil Rights Commission of the State of Colorado to conduct research studies relating to the duties and functions of the Commission. In 1965, a consulting committee was formed consisting of social scientists, persons affiliated with the Colorado Civil Rights Commission, and representatives of the Colorado Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. The role of this committee is to consider ways of effectively utilizing the research monies of the Commission. A number of meetings have been held to define meaningful areas for work and then to develop appropriate methodologies which would provide valid information regarding the problem investigated.

The present study is a result of these deliberations, wherein relationships between minority groups and selected governmental agencies are studied with a view toward determining the presence of discriminatory practices on the part of the representatives of selected governmental bodies. The purpose of this research was not to determine the extent to which contacts might be non-discriminatory to determine if discrimination was present in various governmental agencies and the forms such practices might take.

A two-fold study was thus contemplated and carried out. The first was restricted to the Denver area and undertook to determine what governmental agencies should be studied in depth. The second, or follow-up phase of this work, attempted to examine in considerable detail the nature and pattern of contacts between minority persons and those official groups selected for further investigation.

Both aspects of the overall study involved sampling procedures of demonstrated validity. Part I explicates in considerable detail these methodological considerations. The form of presentation employed in Part II speaks less directly to the specifics of design, hence Appendix A contains additional information on the problem of sampling and assessment.

Because of the premature release of Part II of this study and the comments elicited from many sources, Appendix B is provided.

I. Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to examine the nature of relationships between minority groups and governmental agencies in the Denver area. Within this general purpose, several specific objectives were delineated:

(1) To determine the relative frequency of contact between minority group members and the various city, state, and federal agencies.

(2) To examine the nature of existing relationships between minority group members and governmental agencies. The intent here was to focus upon impressions of either fair or unfair (especially discriminatory) treatment of minority group members.

(3) From examination of both qualitative and quantitative data to determine which (if any) agencies were seen as particularly offensive. Such agencies would then be recommended for more intensive study in order to determine both the nature of offensive practices and what could be done to improve the status of their minority group relationships.

The rationale for these specific objectives will be outlined briefly as follows.

Examination of the complex relationships between minority groups and governmental agencies raises the question of the frequency of contact between people and agencies. First, it is a matter of some interest to see with which agencies minority groups have frequent (either voluntary or involuntary) as opposed to infrequent contact. On the basis of frequency of contact alone the nature of treatment afforded by the agency becomes more or less important. Agency A, for example, might provide extremely discriminatory treatment on the rare occasions when it has contact with minority group members. Agency B, on the other hand, might infrequently provide discriminatory treatment, but because it continuously deals with minority groups the ramifications of such occasional lapses would be extreme. Agency B, in this example, would assume priority in its contribution to a general social problem.

Secondly, frequency of contact data is of interest in that it provides an index of the extent to which minority groups use governmental services which are available to them.

Such an objective fact used comparatively (both between different minority groups and between minority and majority groups) could provide an indirect measure of perceived availability of governmental services. With the emphasis in this society upon certain ends--usually defined in terms of middle-class values--legitimatized means to these ends need to be available, both objectively and subjectively. If, for example, Negroes have the impression that the police are not really interested in protecting their persons and property from lawbreakers, then adherence to the law and the acquisition of property (a valued end in the middle-class value structure) become exercises in futility. Perceived availability of governmental services can be construed as an important aspect of access to legitimatized means to valued end-states. When majority group (e.g., middle-class) values or end-states are accepted, but there is limited access to means of attaining these ends, deviancy in various forms will result.

The second objective of the present study was to examine the nature of minority group-governmental agency relationships. Given the practical limitations of time and money, two strategies were possible: (1) an intensive interview of a very limited number of minority group members; (2) a limited interview with a larger, more representative sample of subjects. In view of the desire for greater generality of findings, the latter strategy was chosen. Given this research strategy, two considerations affecting the nature of the findings should be noted.

The first has to do with the necessarily subjective character of the data. In assessing "impressions of treatment" the weight of concern was upon the subject's subjective experience--with the way he "felt" he was treated, independent of the objective characteristics of the situation. Two factors may be cited in justification for this procedure. First, there was no way to directly ascertain the objective nature of the interaction (which, incidentally, is the focus of a second, in depth study). Secondly, a perceived inequity is just as "real" to the individual as the real thing and is therefore just as important to discover.

The second consideration has to do with the sensitivity of the problem area. It was understood at the outset that it would be difficult to obtain data that required the subject to report on events which were part of his private life.

The difficulty of the task was compounded by the nature of the information desired. It is one thing to ask a person which of two shaving lotions he uses. It is quite another to ask him if he feels he was treated fairly by a police officer when he was arrested! Even though the purpose of the interview was carefully explained to all subjects, it must be assumed that a general tendency to make evaluations in a socially desirable manner was present.

II. Methodology

(1) Design. The general design of the study was survey-interview using a two-stage cluster sample. A first stage sampling fraction of 1 in 2 and a second stage sample fraction of 1 in 5 resulted in 581 randomly selected dwelling units from census tracts 12, 16, 18, 24A, 24B, and 25 of the City and County of Denver. These census tracts were selected on the basis of having the highest proportion of non-white population and population with Spanish surnames and highest unemployment in the 1960 census. The geographical extent of the sample frame was defined so as to yield approximately equal proportions of Negro, Spanish-American, and Anglo subgroups.

(2) Response rate. Of the 581 dwelling units in the original sample, 160 proved to be vacant or condemned. Of the remaining 421 potential interviews, 344 were subsequently completed for an 81.71% response rate (see Table 1), an adequate response rate for the purposes of this study.

(3) Interviewer-subject matching. Considering the potential sensitivity of the problem areas, the attempt was made to match the ethnicity of the interviewer with that of the subjects. To this end two Negro, two Spanish-American, and two Anglo interviewers (all female employees of Research Services, Inc., a commercial survey research firm) were selected. Due to the inability to predict the exact ethnic constitution of a particular dwelling unit or, in some cases, of areas in the sample, the matching procedure was less successful than would have been desired. In spite of the difficulties, however, 217 of 336 possible matches were made (64.58% successful matches). Table 2 provides a classification of matching for the total sample. Table 3 provides a further classification by sex within ethnic group. Table 4 shows the extent of matching. Inspection of the diagonals in Table 4 shows that in no case was the rate of matching at less than 60%. And, finally, in Table 5, it can be seen that approximately one-third of the total interviews was

TABLE 1

SAMPLE RESPONSE RATE DATA

(1) ORIGINAL SAMPLE (DWELLING UNITS)		581
(2) DWELLING UNITS ELIMINATED (VACANT OR CONDEMNED)		160
A. BY MAIL RESPONSE	46	
B. BY INTERVIEWER VISIT	114	
(3) TOTAL POTENTIAL INTERVIEWS (1) - (2)		421
(4) INTERVIEW TERMINATIONS OR REFUSALS		
A. INTERVIEWER		42
B. RESPONDENT		21
(5) CALL-BACK ELIMINATIONS (6-8 CALL-BACKS)		20
(6) TOTAL INTERVIEWS NOT COMPLETED (4) + (5)		83
(7) TOTAL INTERVIEWS COMPLETED		344
(8) PERCENTAGE NONRESPONSE		18.29
(9) PERCENTAGE RESPONSE		81.71

TABLE 2

MATCHING OF ETHNICITY (INTERVIEWER X SUBJECTS)*

		INTERVIEWERS			
		NEGRO	SP.AM.	ANGLO	TOTAL
SUBJECTS SUBGROUPS	NEGRO	83	9	37	119
	SPANISH-AMERICAN	14	87	42	143
	ANGLO	7	20	47	74
	MISC	2	2	4	8
	TOTAL	106	118	130	344

*Cell entries represent numbers of subjects

TABLE 3

SEX OF SUBJECT SUBGROUPS INTERVIEWED BY NEGRO, SPANISH-AMERICAN, AND ANGLO INTERVIEWERS*

			INTERVIEWERS**			
		SEX	NEGRO	SPAN.AM.	ANGLO	TOTAL
SUBJECT SUBGROUPS	NEGRO	M	26	5	9	40
		F	47	4	28	119
	SPANISH-AMERICAN	M	4	43	17	64
		F	10	44	25	79
	ANGLO	M	3	10	17	30
		F	4	10	30	44
	MISC	M	0	1	1	2
		F	2	1	3	6

*Cell entries represent number of subjects
**All interviewers were female

TABLE 4

MATCHING OF ETHNICITY (INTERVIEWERS X SUBJECTS)

Percentage of Each Subject Sub-group Interviewed By Negro, Spanish-American, and Anglo Interviewers

		INTERVIEWERS			
		NEGRO	SPAN.AM.	ANGLO	TOTALS*
SUBJECT SUBGROUPS	NEGRO	61.34	7.56	31.09	99.99
	SPANISH-AMERICAN	9.79	60.84	29.37	100.00
	ANGLO	9.46	27.03	63.51	100.00
	MISC	25.00	25.00	50.00	100.00

*Totals less than 100% due to rounding

TABLE 5

INTERVIEWS COMPLETED BY NEGRO, SPANISH-AMERICAN, AND ANGLO INTERVIEWERS (N = 6)

	INTERVIEWER ETHNIC GROUP		
	NEGRO	SPAN.AM.	ANGLO
NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS	106	118	130
% OF TOTAL SAMPLE	30.81	34.30	37.79

made by each of the three subgroups of interviewers. Thus, while the matching of ethnicity was imperfect, it was by no means substantial enough to insert a major bias. (The "MISC" category included Indians and Orientals.)

(4) Sample composition. In Table 6, the classification of each of the minority groups sampled by sex of subject is shown. Several characteristics of the sample should be noted. First, the totals were close to those anticipated. It will be recalled that the sample was selected in such a way as to yield approximately equal numbers of Negro, Spanish-American, and Anglo subjects. Actually, there were a few more Spanish-American, a few less Anglo, and just about the anticipated number of Negroes. Second, the sample of each group was somewhat weighted in favor of females, the subgroup proportions being approximately as follows: Negro, .66; Spanish-American, .55; and Anglo, .59.

A more surprising characteristic of the sample is revealed in Table 7, which shows the mean ages of subjects in the subgroups. As can be seen in Table 7, the subjects were a good deal older than might have been expected from a random sample of the population at large. The conclusion which must be drawn from these data is that the population characteristics of the areas sampled had changed in such a

TABLE 6

SAMPLE COMPOSITION 1

	NEGRO			SPANISH-AMERICAN			ANGLO			MISC		
	M	F	TOTAL	M	F	TOTAL	M	F	TOTAL	M	F	TOTAL
N	40	79	119	64	79	143	30	44	74	2	6	8
% OF SUBGROUP	33.61	66.38	100.00	44.76	55.24	100.00	40.54	59.46	100.00	35.00	75.00	100.00
% OF TOTAL SAMPLE	11.63	22.96	34.59	18.6	22.96	41.57	8.72	12.79	21.51	.58	1.74	2.32

TABLE 7

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS: AGE

		N	$\bar{X}$ AGE	N	$\bar{X}$ AGE
NEGRO	M	40	51.90		
	F	79	48.86		
Total				119	49.88
SPANISH-AMERICAN	M	64	49.41		
	F	79	44.31		
Total				143	46.59
ANGLO	M	30	58.50		
	F	44	52.91		
Total				74	55.18
MISC	M	2	46.00		
	F	6	48.00		
Total				8	47.50
			TOTAL	344	49.60

way that a higher proportion of older people reside in these areas. Support for this conclusion is found in the fact that the age and sex characteristics of the sample were obtained in spite of the interviewer's schedules (interviewers worked principally between the hours of 4:00 and 8:00 P.M. and throughout the days on weekends). The intent of such interview schedules was (1) to obtain male respondents who were more likely to be home during such hours, and (2) to interview subjects of working age who were likely to be unavailable during normal working hours. Thus, there was an unanticipated difference between these subject characteristics and those which might have been expected, given these methodological precautions.

(5) Interview. The interview (see Appendix A) was semi-structured and designed to be administered in an average time of 15 minutes. Two kinds of items were used: (1) open-ended items (#'s 1, 4, & 7), designed to elicit spontaneous mention of any agency which happened to be particularly salient; (2) structured items (#'s 2, 5, 8), in which lists of specific agencies at city, state, and federal levels were read to the subject. However it was elicited, any mention of contact with a governmental agency was evaluated by filling out a Contact Evaluation Form (Appendix B).

III. Results

(1) Agency evaluations obtained. The 344 interviews complted yielded a total of 1141 separate agency evaluations.

(2) Frequency of contact. Tables 8A and 8B summarize the frequency of contact for each subgroups of the sample at the three levels of government.

It is interesting to note the different rates of contact reported across groups at these three levels of government. State agencies showed the lowest rate of contact, followed by federal and city respectively. City agencies showed roughly three times the rate of contact of state agencies. Federal agencies were contacted twice as many times as state agencies. On the basis of a frequency-priority criterion alone, the present data would argue for further study of agencies of city government.

For each of the subgroups sampled, the mean number of contacts with governmental agencies were computed (Table 8B). As can be seen in Table 8B, the mean contacts reported were highest for Spanish-Americans (4.62), next highest for Anglos (2.73), and lowest for Negroes (2.16). (The number of subjects in the "MISC" category is small enough to preclude further consideration.) To provide some contextual meaning for these figures, it should be recalled that subjects were

TABLE 8A

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH THREE LEVELS OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

		FEDERAL (15)			STATE (9)			CITY (19)		
		Spon	Elic	Total	Spon	Elic	Total	Spon	Elic	Total
NEGRO	M	14	16	30	6	12	18	25	21	46
	F	21	16	37	11	19	30	55	41	96
				67			48			142
SPANISH-AMERICAN	M	4	93	97	2	58	60	4	169	173
	F	5	96	101	3	47	50	12	168	180
				198			110			353
ANGLO	M	7	26	33	5	16	21	3	54	57
	F	4	22	26	1	18	19	2	44	46
				59			40			103
MISC	M	1	5	6	0	3	3	0	3	3
	F	0	3	3	0	3	3	1	2	3
				9			6			6
TOTAL		56	277	333	28	176	204	102	502	604

TABLE 8B

TOTALS

		FEDERAL	STATE	CITY	TOTAL	MEAN
NEGRO	M	30	18	46	94	
	F	37	30	96	163	
		67	48	142	257	($\overline{X}$ = 2.16)
SPANISH-AMERICAN	M	97	60	173	330	
	F	101	50	180	331	
		198	110	353	661	($\overline{X}$ = 4.62)
ANGLO	M	33	21	57	111	
	F	26	19	46	91	
		59	40	103	202	($\overline{X}$ = 2.73)
MISC	M	6	3	3	12	
	F	3	3	3	9	
		9	6	6	21	($\overline{X}$ = 2.62)
TOTAL		333	204	604	1141	($\overline{X}$ = 3.32)

asked about contact with governmental agencies during the past year (i.e., Negroes in the sample had an average of about two contacts with governmental agencies during the past year, whereas Spanish-Americans had twice that many).

In Tables 9A, 9B, and 9C the frequency data for the specific agencies contacted are presented in rank order form from highest to lowest. These tables are self-explanatory.

(3) Agency ratings. The 1141 Contact Evaluation Forms (Appendix B) were scored as follows: 5 point ratings were made on items 5, 6, 9, and 10. Initial examination of item-score distributions showed no significant differences either of means or variances for these items. Therefore, a composite score was obtained by summing across item values for items 5, 6, 9, and 10. The means of such scores were then computed for each subsample group for each agency rated.

Due to the low frequency of contact with many agencies represented in the sample, the number of meaningful comparisons which could be made was limited. An arbitrary criterion level was set--only those agencies receiving ratings from 10% or more of all subsample groups were compared. Those comparisons possible on this basis are presented in Tables 10 (City agencies), 11(State agencies), and 12 (Federal agencies). Given the scoring system used, the higher the mean

TABLE 9A

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH SPECIFIC GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

	NEGRO			SPANISH-AMERICAN			ANGLO			
	Male (N=40)	Female (N=79)	Total (N=119)	Male (N=64)	Female (N=79)	Total (N=143)	Male (N=30)	Female (N=44)	Total (N=74)	Grand Total N=336
FEDERAL										
Soc.Secur.	13	20	33	19	25	44	13	12	25	102
Post Office	6	4	10	27	39	66	10	4	14	90
释Internl Rev.	1	2	3	26	17	43	6	3	9	55
VA Hospital	4	0	4	9	2	11	1	1	2	17
Youth Corps	0	3	3	4	9	13	1	0	1	17
Job Corps	1	2	3	2	3	5	0	1	1	9
Civil Service	4	1	5	1	0	1	0	1	1	7
Emplymt	0	2	2	3	0	3	0	1	1	6
FBI	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	4
Selective Ser.	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	4
Housing	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	3
Agricult.	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2
Neighbhd.Hlth.	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Narcotics	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	3
Fam.Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Aviation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 9B

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH SPECIFIC GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

	NEGRO			SPANISH-AMERICAN			ANGLO			
	Male (N=40)	Female (N=79)	Total (N=119)	Male (N=64)	Female (N=79)	Total (N=143)	Male (N=30)	Female (N=44)	Total (N=74)	Grand Total N=336
STATE										
Driver Lic.	8	7	16	27	15	42	6	8	14	71
Welfare	4	16	20	7	19	26	6	7	13	59
Auto Lic.	9	5	14	21	15	36	6	3	9	59
Emplymt.	3	6	9	10	6	16	2	1	3	28
State Patrol	2	1	3	13	5	18	4	1	5	26
Lookmt.Schl.	0	0	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	5
Civil Rghts.Com.	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	3
Natl.Guard	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2
Ft. Logan	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	3

TABLE 9C

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH SPECIFIC GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

	NEGRO			SPANISH-AMERICAN			ANGLO			
	Male (N=40)	Female (N=79)	Total (N=119)	Male (N=64)	Female (N=79)	Total (N=143)	Male (N=30)	Female (N=44)	Total (N=74)	Grand Total N=336
CITY										
Den.General	12	32	44	33	47	80	10	11	21	145
Police	6	5	11	22	23	45	11	10	21	77
Pub.Schls	2	11	13	14	26	40	4	3	7	60
Welfare	4	17	21	8	10	18	7	8	15	54
Library	2	3	5	14	9	23	5	4	9	37
Traffic Court	3	4	7	13	8	21	5	1	6	34
Housing	1	11	12	3	12	15	2	1	3	30
Water Dept.	1	1	2	10	8	18	2	0	2	22
County Jail	2	1	3	10	3	13	2	2	4	20
Juv.Hall	0	3	3	7	8	15	0	1	1	19
Probat.	0	2	2	8	7	15	0	0	0	17
Civil Court	2	0	2	4	1	5	0	0	0	7
Crim.Court	1	0	1	4	2	6	2	0	2	9
Civ.Service	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	3
Clerk&Recorder	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
Golf	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2
Comm.Rel.	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

TABLE 10

EVALUATIONS* ($\bar{X}$ RATINGS) OF CITY AGENCIES**

Agency	NEGRO	SPANISH-AMERICAN	ANGLO	$\bar{X}$
Public Schools	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.1
Denver General	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6
Welfare	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.6
Police	3.2	3.8	3.9	3.6
Traffic Court	2.9	3.4	3.5	3.3

TABLE 11

EVALUATIONS* ($\bar{X}$ RATINGS) OF STATE AGENCIES**

Agency	NEGRO	SPANISH-AMERICAN	ANGLO	$\bar{X}$
Auto License	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.1
Driver's License	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1
Welfare	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.9
Employment	3.3	3.7	3.9	3.6

TABLE 12

EVALUATIONS* ($\bar{X}$ RATINGS) OF FEDERAL AGENCIES**

Agency	NEGRO	SPANISH-AMERICAN	ANGLO	$\bar{X}$
Social Security	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2
Post Office	4.2	4.3	3.8	4.1

*Mean ratings based on interview items 5, 6A-D, 9A-E, and 10. (Higher scores indicate more favorable ratings, lower scores more unfavorable)

**Evaluations produced by 10% or more of all subsample groups rating the more positive the evaluation. Additionally, given the general positive nature of the ratings, any agency receiving a mean rating of less than 4.00 can most meaningfully be interpreted as having been negatively evaluated.

On the basis of the rating criterion alone, as inspection of Tables 10, 11, and 12 would indicate, the relationships between minority groups and the following agencies merit further study: Denver General Hospital, Denver Welfare, Denver Police, Denver Traffic Court, Colorado Welfare, and Colorado Employment.

Tables 13, 14, and 15 show a further analysis of the rating data in which each of the subgroups was divided into two age categories--under age of 40 years and over age of 40 years--and new mean ratings computed. Because of the small number of subjects falling in some cells these means should be regarded as suggestive rather than conclusive. A comparison of agency ratings made by the younger subjects (those under 40) shown in Table 13 (City agencies) and Table 14 (State agencies) with those in Table 15 (Federal agencies), provides additional indication of the need for further study of the agencies listed above.

Finally, in Table 16, the ratings are combined to show the comparisons between minority (Negro and Spanish-American)

TABLE 13

AGE SUBGROUP'S EVALUATIONS OF CITY AGENCIES*

Agency	Under 40			Over 40		
	NEGRO	SP.AM.	ANGLO	NEGRO	SP.AM.	ANGLO
Denver General	3.10	4.20	3.31	4.09	3.85	3.68
Police	2.35	3.14	4.08	4.14	3.76	3.83
Welfare	1.15	1.75	1.47	3.93	4.61	4.30
Traffic Courts	3.12	3.38	4.11	3.92	3.03	3.50
Public Schools	4.07	4.42	4.02	4.14	4.40	4.38

TABLE 14

AGE SUBGROUP'S EVALUATIONS OF STATE AGENCIES*

Agency	Under 40			Over 40		
	NEGRO	SP.AM.	ANGLO	NEGRO	SP.AM.	ANGLO
Employment	3.54	3.57	3.75	3.25	3.61	3.83
Welfare	3.71	3.92	4.08	4.35	4.05	3.89
Driver's License	4.72	4.03	4.25	3.67	4.06	4.24
Auto License	4.58	4.22	3.96	4.49	3.82	3.89

TABLE 15

AGE SUBGROUP'S EVALUATIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES*

Agency	Under 40			Over 40		
	NEGRO	SP.AM.	ANGLO	NEGRO	SP.AM.	ANGLO
Post Office	3.75	4.15	4.17	4.50	4.98	4.06
Social Security	4.45	3.93	4.44	4.45	4.16	4.05

*Mean ratings based on interview items 5, 6A-D, 9A-E, and 10. (Higher scores indicate more favorable ratings, lower scores more unfavorable)

TABLE 16

AGENCY RATINGS*: COMPARISON BETWEEN MINORITY AND MAJORITY GROUPS FOR TWO AGE SUBDIVISIONS

Agency	Under 40		Over 40	
	MINORITY	MAJORITY	MINORITY	MAJORITY
Denver General	3.79	3.31	3.93	3.68
Police	2.90	4.08	3.80	3.83
Denver Welfare	1.43	1.47	4.23	4.30
Traffic Courts	3.30	4.11	3.24	3.50
State Employment	3.56	3.75	3.47	3.83
State Welfare	3.85	4.08	4.21	3.89

*Mean ratings based on interview items 5, 6A-D, 9A-E, and 10. (Higher scores indicate more favorable ratings, lower scores more unfavorable) group ratings and majority (Anglo) group ratings. Again, it should be noted that as some of the cells represent a small number of cases (thus precluding statistical significance tests) these figures are suggestive rather than conclusive. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that of the twelve possible comparisons between minority and majority groups' ratings, nine comparisons show the minority group rating the agency lower than the majority group. Of the three comparisons where reversals (minority group rating higher than majority group) occurred, only in one is the minority group rating over 4.00. Thus, the other two can also be interpreted as essentially negative ratings of the agency, with the majority rating concurring with the rating of the minority group.

(4) Composite recommendations. On the basis of reasoning advanced above, recommendations for further study of specific agencies are to be made using a dual criterion: (1) that the agency be evaluated negatively with respect to its treatment of minority group members, and (2) that it have sufficient (i.e., substantial) contact with minority groups.

On the basis of criterion (2) it would seem reasonable to rule out state agencies, which leaves city and federal. Federal agencies can be eliminated on the basis of criterion (1), as can Denver Public Schools,and Automobile License.

Thus, the recommendation can be made that the relationships between minority groups and the following Denver agencies merit a more intensive examination than was possible under the limitations of the present study: Denver General Hospital, Denver Welfare, Denver Police, and Denver Traffic Court.

Finally, one particularly salient aspect of the results and conclusions of this study should be pointed out. It was an unintentional outcome that the sample included rather more older, female subjects than might have been desired. It can be reasonably assumed, on a priori grounds, that such a subgroup of any ethnic group would be exactly that group with the least fear of and the most investment in governmental agencies. The operation of these factors should have been in the direction of producing uniformly positive evaluations. The present study thus represented a most stringent test of the hypothesis that problems between some agencies of government and minority groups do exist. Therefore, all of the results obtained should be evaluated in light of this fact.

APPENDIX A
(INTERVIEW SCHEDULE)

ID NO.____________________

AGENCY TREATMENT SURVEY
June 1966

Respondent__________________________/__________________________
Name Address

Sex: M F Approximate age___Interview Time: Began___Ended___

I'm (Name of Interviewer). I'm here for the Civil Right Commission. I believe you received a letter from us telling you I would be here. We are conducting a survey of families in the Denver area.

As you know, the city, state, and federal governments have lots of different agencies and departments. While these various agencies and departments have different jobs, most of them have to deal with the public at one time or another. This is what we are interested in.

We would like to find out what your opinions are about how good a job these agencies are doing in dealing with people like yourself. Your opinions are very important in this survey and we appreciate your help.

1. First, I'd like to know if you can think of an agency or department of the Federal government that you might happen to have had some personal contact with this past year or so? Do any come to mind?
   - A. If NO, go to Federal List.
   - B. If YES, and it is a Federal agency, fill out Contact Evaluation Sheet.
   - C. List all agencies named--whether actually Federal agencies or not.

   ____

   ____

Interviewer__________________________Date______________

FEDERAL LIST

2. Now I would like to check several Federal Agencies to see if--by any chance--you might happen to have had any contact with them in the last year or so. As I read the name of the agency would you say YES if you have dealt with them personally this past year or so, or NO if you have not?

   Check ( ) if YES

   ____Agriculture
   ____Civil Service Commission
   ____FBI
   ____Housing Administration (Home Loan)
   ____Veterans Administration Hospital
   ____Social Security
   ____Children's Bureau (H.E.W.)
   ____Family Services (H.E.W.)
   ____Neighborhood Youth Corps
   ____Job Corps
   ____U.S. Employment Service
   ____Post Office
   ____Selective Service Commission
   ____Internal Revenue Service
   ____Narcotics Bureau

3. Fill out Contact Evaluation Form for each personal contact.

4. Now, I'd like to know if you can think of an agency or department of the State government of Colorado that you might have had contact with during the past year or so? Do any come to mind?

   A. If NO, go to State List

   B. If YES and it is a State agency, fill out Contact Evaluation form. If it is not a state agency, go to STATE LIST.

   C. List all agencies named--whether actually State agencies or not.

   ____

   ____

STATE LIST

5. Now I'd like to check several State agencies to see if--by any chance--you might happen to have had any contact with them in the last year or so. As I read the name of the agency would you say YES if you have dealt with them personally this past year or so, or NO if you have not?

Check (   ) if YES

____Civil Rights Commission
____Colorado State Patrol
____Employment Department
____Fort Logan Mental Hlth.Centr.
____Lookout Mt.Schl.for Boys
____National Guard
____Mt.View Girls' Schl.
____Public Welfare Dept.
____Driver's License Bur.

6. Fill out Contact Evaluation Form for each personal contact indicated.

7. Now I'd like to know if you can think of an agency or department of Denver city government that you have had personal contact with during the past year or so? Do any come to mind?

    A. If NO, go to Denver List.

    B. If YES, and it is a Denver agency, fill out Contact Evaluation Form. If it is not a Denver agency, go to Denver List.

    C. List all agencies named--whether or not actually Denver agency.

DENVER LIST

8. Now I'd like to check several Denver governmental agencies to see if--by any chance- you might have happened to have had any personal contact with them in the past year or so. As I read the names will you again say YES if you have dealt with them personally this past year or so, or NO if you have not?

Check (   ) if YES

____Civil Service Commission
____Clerk and Recorder
____Commission on Community Relations
____Traffic Court
____Civil Court
____Criminal Court
____Juvenile Hall
____Probation Dept.
____Public Schools
____Golf Courses
___County Jail
___Libraries
___Auto License Bureau
___Police Dept.
___Sheriff's Dept.
___Welfare Dept.
___Housing Projects
___Water Dept.
___Denver General Hospital

9. Fill out Contact Evaluation Form for each personal contact indicated.

APPENDIX B
(CONTACT EVALUATION FORM)

CONTACT EVALUATION FORM Interviewer ID#________________

1. Level (check one) Federal____State____City____
2. Agency name________________________________
3. Approximate date of contact________________________
4. Nature of contact____________________________
5. Treatment as a person? (nondirect, overall evaluation)
   ____
6. Treatment as a person--Would you say that they were...to you personally?
   - a. Efficient____ ____ ____ ____ ____Inefficient
   - b. Courteous____ ____ ____ ____ ____Discourteous
   - c. Respectful____ ____ ____ ____ ____Disrespectful
   - d. Liked you____ ____ ____ ____ ____Disliked you
   - e. Fair ____ ____ ____ ____ ____Unfair

   Other comments:______________________________
   ____
7. Was everyone there that you saw getting the same kind of treatment:
   Yes____No____If "no" how were people being differently treated? Comment:________________________
   ____
   ____
8. Did everybody you had contact with treat you about the same, or were there differences? Comment:________________
   ____
9. When you were through with the________________, did you feel more...toward them?
   - a. happy ____ ____ ____ ____ ____unhappy
   - b. angry ____ ____ ____ ____ ____not angry
   - c. upset ____ ____ ____ ____ ____pleased
   - d. respectful____ ____ ____ ____ ____disrespectful
   - e. liked them____ ____ ____ ____ ____disliked them
10. If you knew one of your good friends was going to have contact with ________________, and they asked you what to expect, what would you tell them? Comment:________________
    ____
    ____
11. Any other comments regarding agency contact:______________
    ____

Consulting Committee Action
Following Submission of Report on
First Phase of the Investigation.

Following submission of the report on the first phase of the overall investigation, the consulting committee met a number of times to review the findings reported and thus to determine the manner in which the second phase study would be carried out.

It was decided that Mr. Frank Plaut, a lawyer, would undertake this work. Considerable discussion ensued regarding selection of the governmental agencies to be studied and ways of conducting this aspect of the research.

In Part I of the study only Denver residents were utilized. There was never any doubt that the perspectives of minority persons could be very well assessed by studying such individuals in Denver. It seemed most likely that Denverites would have the widest acquaintance with public agencies, and although the urban setting could color minority group-governmental agency relationships, it was believed this influence would be in degree rather than kind.

Another consideration which occupied the committee members concerned the necessity of selecting agencies with which minority persons would have experience, but which would represent not only the City and County of Denver but also those of the State of Colorado and other municipalities. Still it was accepted that the central position of Denver, politically, socially, and economically required that it occupy a central role in the follow-up investigation. The investigators who conducted the first aspect of the overall study recommended four Denver governmental bodies. The committee decided to accept only two of these and then to sample similar agencies outside of the City and County of Denver. In addition, the State Employment Service was chosen. The basis for these choices was as follows.

First, it was felt that time and money limitations necessitated at most an investigation of three agencies in order to carry out the study successfully. Second, agencies were to be selected that occupied a critical and central place in the lives of minority persons. Third, it was felt that high congruence should exist among minority groups in their perception of the positiveness-negativeness of the agencies and that the discrepancies between majority and minority groups should be maximal if evidences of discrimination are to be revealed. Finally, an effort should be made to select agencies which were not simply regarded negatively by minority persons, but which essentially span the entire range of attitudes.

Tables 12, 14, and 16 were thus examined relative to the various agencies. Ranking the agencies along the positiveness-negativeness dimension, the desired congruence was observed over the minority groups. This seemed to hold true for all of the public bodies studied. Apparently there are general perceptions which hold for persons regardless of their group identity. Rather consistently the minorities are more negative than majority Anglos. This is especially clear in the case of the State Employment Service which was rated most negatively by all groups, but more so by Negroes and Spanish-American persons (see Table 14). When the same ranking procedure is applied to Table 16, it becomes evident that the three agencies which reveal the greatest minority-majority group discrepancies across age groups are respectively Denver General Hospital, the Police, and the State Employment Service. In all instances, except one, the minority persons interviewed perceive these agencies more negatively than do majority individuals. The only exception is for minority persons over 40 years old who view Denver General Hospital more favorably than their majority counterparts. Overall, minority persons seem most negative to the Traffic Courts and most positive to State Welfare. The three agencies noted above fall in the mid-range of positiveness-negativeness.

Returning to the other criteria cited earlier, it will be noted that Denver General Hospital, the Police, and the State Employment Service meet these quite well. Health, police protection and relations, and employment are most central in the lives of both minority and majority groups. The criteria of congruence across the minority groups and discrepancies between the minorities and majority have been discussed. In addition, these three agencies are not simply regarded negatively but rather appear representative of the attitude range. The decision was thus made to choose for further study in Part II of this investigation Public Hospitals, various Police Departments and a number of State Employment Offices. The specific breakdown for such agencies is found on pages 2 and 3 of Part II. For apparent reasons, the majority of observations and time spent in conducting the investigation was carried out in Denver.

Questions of research design, sampling, and methodology were also considered crucial. To attempt in the second phase of the study an approach similar to that utilized in the first would have required funds far in excess of those available. This necessitated a procedure that emphasized time-sampling of work operations. Various names have been applied to such methods; i.e., ratio-delay, process-analysis, random-check analysis, etc. The approach adapted for the study was to focus on what are known as critical-incidents, illustrative actions which indicated prejudice and discrimination on the part of public officials. These methods are extensively used in the assessment of business and industrial practices and have been shown to be quite valid.

The presentation of the information to be obtained posed another problem. Since the material to be collected would largely be in the nature of critical-incidents, the decision was made to employ the anthropological style of exposition and simply illustrate by reference to concrete items that which was observed. It was felt that some of the more technical aspects of this work could be handled in appropriate appendices. Appendex A presents additional information regarding the methodology of Part II.

MINORITY GROUP - GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY RELATIONS

PART II

INVESTIGATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Prepared By

FRANK PLAUT

1967

Consulting Committee

PART II

Minority Group-Government Agency Relations Study

Dr. D. K. Adams, Department of Psychology, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado

Dr. Robert Amundson, Professor of Sociology, Loretto Heights College, Denver, Colorado

James A. Atkins, Writer, 2720 Race Street, Denver, Colorado

Dr. George E. Bardwell, Department of Mathematics, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado

Senator George Brown, Member, Colorado Advisory Committee to U. S. Civil Rights Commission

Dr. Edward Rose, Department of Sociology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Mrs. Connie Sisneros, Chairman, Colorado Civil Rights Commission

Dr. Bernard Spilka, Department of Psychology, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado

Max Torres, Acting Chairman, Colorado Advisory Committee, U. S. Civil Rights Commission

James F. Reynolds, Director, Colorado Civil Rights Commission

Ruth Steiner, Civil Rights Specialist, Colorado Civil Rights Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 29

Incidents of Discrimination
Colorado Department of Employment (Various offices). 33
Denver General Hospital 35
Aurora Police Department. 37
Denver Police Department. 37

Recommendations
Colorado Department of Employment 43
Local Public Hospitals. 46
Local Law Enforcement Agencies. 47
General 53

Conclusion. 56

Suggested Bibliography. . . . . 58 - 59

INTRODUCTION

This study is the second portion of a general survey of minority group - governmental agency relations conducted by the Colorado Civil Rights Commission and the Colorado Advisory Committee of the United States Civil Rights Commission. The first part was an attitude survey conducted in the Denver area based upon interviewing and sampling techniques, which indicated that local police departments, general hospitals, and the State employment service should be studied and investigated. This second portion of the general survey concerns itself with study and investigation of those agencies.

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To determine if discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry exists at the point where minority group persons come in contact with the governmental agencies studied.

2. If it is found that discrimination does exist, to ascertain the manner in which such discrimination is carried out or practiced, the context in which it occurs, and the form it takes.

3. To determine what steps should be taken to remedy or alleviate such discrimination as is found to exist,

and to improve the relationship between the affected minority groups and the agencies studied.

As used in this study, "discrimination" means any conduct based on a distinction made on grounds of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry, which distinction has no relation either to individual capacities or merits or to the concrete behavior of the individual person.

Certain matters should be noted at the outset:

1. The investigative technique used herein was basically one of observing, in as inconspicuous a manner as possible, the ordinary and routine contacts between citizens (both minority and non-minority) and the selected governmental agencies. Observation in hospitals was, for the most part, done by persons with professional medical training.

2. A total of 830 hours was spent in actual observation of police departments, general hospitals, and the State employment service in various Colorado communities as set forth below:

	No. of Hours
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, Denver Offices	**118**
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, Pueblo Offices	**7**
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, Fort Morgan	**4**
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, Greeley	**5**

	No. of Hours
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT Englewood	2
DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT	258
FORT MORGAN POLICE DEPARTMENT	10
AURORA POLICE DEPARTMENT	1
PUEBLO POLICE DEPARTMENT	16
DENVER GENERAL HOSPITAL	379
WELD COUNTY HOSPITAL	15
MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, Colorado Springs	15
	830

3. During the course of this study, persons in various agencies being investigated were advised that the investigation was concerned only with such incidents of discrimination, if any, as were found to exist, and was not concerned with the specific identities of any of the parties involved. If such an approach had not been used, substantial opposition to this investigation might have developed within the agencies studied; for that reason, this report does not name names.

4. Because of limitations of time and money, only a small number of governmental agencies were investigated. A large part of the investigative work was done within the City and County of Denver, and as a result, most of the discriminatory conduct set forth herein was observed there. The fact that the discriminatory incidents listed involved only a small

number of governmental agencies and occurred only in Denver and a few other communities does not justify any inference that contacts between minority group persons and other governmental agencies in Colorado are non-discriminatory in nature, or that Denver is a greater offender than other areas.

5. Many non-discriminatory contacts between minority group persons and governmental agencies were observed. Such instances are not within the scope of this report, and will not be mentioned herein.

6. ALL INCIDENTS OF DISCRIMINATION SET FORTH HEREIN WERE ACTUALLY OBSERVED BY INVESTIGATORS EMPLOYED TO ASSIST IN CONDUCTING THIS STUDY.

INCIDENTS OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MINORITY GROUP PERSONS

1. COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT (hereinafter called "CDE").

At some CDE offices, including the farm-labor offices, the department staff does not include any personnel who can serve as interpreters, although a substantial proportion of job applicants is unable to speak English.

In the Denver CDE office at 12th & Sherman Streets, there was a marked difference in the way many non-minority job counselors behaved toward Negro or Spanish-surnamed job applicants as compared to non-minority applicants. For example, some interviewers engaged in "fraternization", handshakes, and small talk with non-minority applicants, while their contacts with minority applicants were civil but detached. This difference in approach was apparent to a casual observer and must no doubt be noticed by minority job applicants as well.

In the CDE casual labor office in Denver, the departmental procedure of referring qualified job applicants to jobs in the order in which they sign the daily registry book is ignored much of the time, with referrals of applicants frequently being made without regard to their position in the daily registry book. Often, departmental employees refer non-minority persons out of order, and bypass Negroes and Spanish-surnamed persons who have priority on the daily registry book.

On July 27, 1967, an investigator placed a call to the CDE Denver Casual Labor Office, requesting that a man be sent out to do some yard work. The caller specified that he did not want any "nigger" or "Mexican". The request was accepted, and an "Anglo" was sent out to fill the job.

On August 11, 1967, an investigator made a telephone call to the CDE Casual Labor Office in Pueblo and placed a job order for a man to do yard work; the investigator specified that he did not want a Negro or Spanish-surnamed person. The CDE employee taking the call responded that "there would be no problem", and that the caller would "get what you want".

On July 26, 1967, a call was made to the CDE Denver Casual Labor Office. The caller identified himself as a professional man, described the work he wished done, and stated that since his family would be home alone he would like a particular type of person. At this point, the CDE placement officer interrupted and said he knew what the caller meant, and would indeed send a "desirable" person. An Anglo was referred to fill the job. While varying conclusions could be drawn from this incident, it is submitted that the manner in which the nature of the job request was anticipated by the placement officer indicates that the request was assumed to be discriminatory and, as such, was filled.

Other discriminatory job orders were placed by investigators - and were accepted - on the dates and at the locations listed below:

Place	Date
CDE, Denver, Casual Labor Office	August 9, 1967
CDE, Fort Morgan	August 7, 1967

2. DENVER GENERAL HOSPITAL (hereinafter called "DGH"). A substantial portion of patients speak Spanish exclusively. Although the hospital has hired at least one person in the admissions section who speaks fluent Spanish, often no effort was made by other admissions office personnel to direct persons with language limitations to the Spanish-speaking staff member.

During June of 1967, a DGH ambulance driver referred to a Spanish-surnamed patient whom he was transporting as a "dirty Mexican" - this reference was made in the presence of, and heard by, the patient. On August 5, 1967, a DGH ambulance driver, in the presence and within the hearing of a Spanish-surnamed patient, was observed to state that "Mexicans always settle an argument with a knife". On August 12, 1967, a doctor at DGH, in the presence and within the hearing of a Negro patient, was observed to state that "Negroes get loaded every weekend". Similar biased statements by DGH personnel, in the presence of minority patients, were observed on a number of additional occasions.

In the emergency room of the hospital, the severity of the condition of an emergency patient is rated upon his arrival as either "urgent", "emergent", "priority I", "priority II", or "priority III". Frequently, this rating was done by non-professional members of the hospital staff, and the evaluation was based to an important degree on the statements and demands of the patient. As a result, minority persons who could not speak English and thus could not make their condition known frequently received less prompt medical treatment in an emergency situation because the severity and urgency of their condition had not been properly evaluated.

(NOTE: Other practices were observed which did not involve racial discrimination but which did show a failure to adhere to proper hospital standards of patient care. For example, the assessment of the necessity of supplying ambulance service to patients who telephoned in for such service was frequently done by non-professional personnel - e.g. clerks, aides and orderlies - as was the administering of aseptic treatment to admitted patients. On several occasions, non-professional hospital personnel were observed engaging in a police function rather than a hospital function, namely the interrogation of a seriously injured patients who were receiving emergency treatment, to determine whether the patients might have been engaged in the commission of a crime at the time they received their injuries).

3. AURORA POLICE DEPARTMENT.

On October 14, 1967, a Negro man and his Anglo female companion sought to enter a lounge in Aurora. There were many available empty tables in the lounge at the time. A uniformed off-duty Aurora policeman was observed to delay them at the door for 20 minutes on the pretext that the manager of the establishment had to seat all customers, although numerous other persons were permitted entry and seated themselves throughout the 20-minute period that the mixed couple was refused entry.

4. DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT (hereinafter called DPD).

Many policemen, in their routine everyday activities (even in situations other than those leading to questioning, investigation or arrest), behaved quite differently in their contacts with minority citizens than they did in their contacts with non-minority citizens. Such officers seldom if ever fraternized or chatted with minority persons; for them, the role of "the friendly cop on the beat" was confined to non-minority citizens. When answering calls to the homes of minority citizens, these officers conducted themselves differently than when answering calls to a non-minority home. For example, such amenities as wiping their feet before entering the home and such inquiries as "May I sit down?" and "Do you mind if I smoke?" were usual in majority homes and absent in minority homes. Officers driving through minority-group residential areas on routine patrol were frequently observed to shine their spotlights into each home as they passed by, a procedure never followed in non-minority areas. While this type of differential treatment may not seem important or improper to the average citizen, the officers knew they were treating minority citizens differently, and the minority citizens undoubtedly knew it too.

During May of 1967, on-duty policemen on two occasions were observed addressing Spanish-surnamed persons whom they did not know as "Jose". On July 22, 1967, two police officers arrested a Negro and took him to jail; during the entire time the Negro was in their custody and presence, one of the officers conducted his conversation in a mocking "Amos and Andy" dialect. On July 1, 1967, an officer approached a Negro man sitting in a crowded waiting room at DGH and asked, in a loud and hostile fashion: "Is your kid down here? Where's the other one - in jail?" On these and numerous other occasions, police officers were observed to engage in unprovoked verbal abuse of minority citizens.

On July 29, 1967, police were observed answering a disturbance call at the home of a Spanish-surnamed family. Following their arrival the police ordered a Spanish-surnamed youth who had apparently been drinking to get out of his car, which was parked in front of the home. When the youth remained seated in the car, an officer roughly pulled him out, slammed him against the side of the car, and searched him. Although such a search can lawfully be made only when incident to a valid arrest, no arrest was made, nor were any charges later filed. The police left the scene immediately thereafter.

On the evening of July 31, 1967, at a shopping center in the Park Hill area of Denver, a crowd of Negroes and a large number of police were observed confronting each other in what can fairly be described as a racially tense situation. A bottle was apparently thrown by someone in the crowd of Negroes. Thereupon, a policeman stopped a Negro man who was walking away from the point of action. The Negro retreated and was struck across the back of his legs by the officer's night riot stick. The Negro and the officer grappled with the officer's riot stick, and the Negro was beaten to the ground. After the Negro was on the ground, he was further struck by other policemen, until an investigator employed to assist in this study intervened. The Negro was not then or thereafter taken into custody or charged with any violation of law.

On October 28, 1967, two policemen in a patrol car were observed in the area of West Colfax Avenue, following a Negro man and his Anglo female companion riding in a 1965 automobile with Denver license plates for one-half hour without any apparent valid reason for doing so. Later on the same date,

γ

the Anglo female made a comment to her Negro male companion about the service they were receiving in a predominantly Negro restaurant, whereupon a uniformed Anglo policeman sitting nearby was observed to comment "if you'd stay in your own part of town, you probably wouldn't run into any problems".

On the evening of July 6, 1967, police were observed on approximately ten different occasions stopping minority youths on the street for questioning, although the youths were not engaged in suspicious conduct. Technically, these youths may have been in violation of Denver's curfew ordinance. However, on the date in question and almost without exception, during the many other occasions when policemen were observed to apply the curfew ordinance, it was applied only to Negro and Spanish-surnamed youths. Groups of minority youths who are doing nothing but standing and talking were often told by police to "break it up" - i.e. to disband and disperse. Similar groups of non-minority youths who were gathered at the same hours and doing the same thing were not disturbed or dispersed by the police. Incidents of this type of discrimination were observed literally scores of times during the course of this investigation. On July 12, 1967, when a Spanish-surnamed youth refused to leave after the group in which he was standing was dispersed by the police, he was arrested and unjustly charged with being drunk in a public place.

It was observed that on almost all routine police calls to a home or other place occupied by Negroes, additional police cars ("cars to cover") were dispatched to the scene, without regard to the seriousness of the incident involved; only one car was ordinarily dispatched on routine calls to a home or other place occupied by Anglos.

A program directed solely and specifically toward youth in the northeast portion (i.e. the heavily Negro area) of Denver was conducted by the community relations division of the DPD with emphasis on those instances when these youths were approached by police "in relation to the driving of vehicles". According to information received from the DPD, the youths were instructed that whenever they became aware that a police officer was trying to stop them they were to stop immediately and respectfully answer questions as to who they were, where they lived, what they were doing and, if the officer wished to look into the car, including the trunk, they were willingly to consent to such a search and to aid the officer by unlocking the trunk if requested to do so. The United States and Colorado constitutions give all citizens the right to refuse to allow a search of their persons, premises or vehicles unless the police have a warrant for such search or unless the search is made incident to a lawful arrest; no citizen need subject himself to questioning or interrogation by the police. This police educational program in effect advised the youth in the heavily Negro section of

Denver to waive their rights.

In approximately 10 weeks of daily observation, incidents such as those described above were not observed in police dealings with non-minority citizens.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since it is at least possible, if not likely, that similar incidents occur in local Colorado Department of Employment offices, local public hospitals, and local police and sheriff's departments other than those investigated, it is suggested that all such agencies within Colorado seriously consider adoption of the recommendations set forth below, to the extent applicable and to the extent they have not already done so.

1. COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

In order to protect minority persons from discrimination in job placement, a separate record should be kept indicating the race, religion, national origin and ancestry of each job applicant. This information should not be available to the departmental personnel whose duties include the referral of prospective employees, but should be available for inspection by the Colorado Civil Rights Commission and other appropriate groups. (NOTE: Although it has been stated by the CDE that the gathering of such data is prohibited by 80-21-6(5), Colorado Revised Statutes, 1963, it is submitted that this view is not justified by a reading of the statute in question.)

The following procedures should be established and enforced:

(a) Discriminatory job orders from any potential employer, whether or not exempt from Colorado's fair employment law, should without exception be refused by all departmental employees at all times.

(b) Job applicants applying for employment as casual labor should, if qualified, be referred in the order in which they apply for employment on any given day.

(c) In order to eliminate the possibility that a prospective employer can discriminate by placing a job order with a CDE office which has few if any minority job applicants, prospective employers should be required to place their job orders with the appropriate CDE office in the community in which such prospective employer is located; applications to other CDE offices should be permitted only if the local CDE office is unable to fill the position.

(d) Spanish-speaking employees should be on the staff of each CDE office which has a substantial number of applicants who speak Spanish exclusively, and should be available to serve as interpreters when needed.

(e) Posters in English and Spanish should be conspicuously posted in all CDE offices, advising that it is the policy of CDE to administer its services in a nondiscriminatory fashion, and that persons who feel they have been discriminated against may file a complaint either with the Colorado Civil Rights Commission or the appropriate division within the CDE, or both.

(f) The CDE should adopt and carry out a continuous and effective program of internal investigation to see that its employees do not engage in discriminatory practices.

(g) Particular care should be taken in the selection, training and supervision of those persons such as receptionists, switchboard operators, and information and referral personnel, who come into contact with many of those who seek the assistance of the department, to assure that they discharge their duties in an impartial and non-discriminatory manner.

(h) Instruction in the basic pronunciation of Spanish names should be given to all departmental employees who have contact with the public.

(i) Job counsellors should be thoroughly trained in the handling of minority employment problems and the counselling and placement of minority job applicants.

It is recommended that the Colorado Statutes be amended to providc as follows:

(a) Any person wilfully violating any fair employment provision of the Colorado Antidiscrimination Act of 1957, as amended, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and punishable accordingly.

(b) An "employment agency" prohibited from engaging in discriminatory and unfair employment practices should be defined specifically to include both public and private employment agencies.

(c) All state agencies engaged in employment referral and placement services for private or public employers should refuse any job order specifying any preference or limitation based on race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry and should refer such prohibitive requests to the Colorado Civil Rights Commission for investigation and other appropriate action.

2. LOCAL PUBLIC HOSPITALS

A procedure should be established and enforced whereby a professionally trained person able to make a medical evaluation evaluates the condition of all persons coming into the hospital for treatment, including those who have difficulty in communicating because they are inarticulate or unable to speak English.

As in the case of the employment department, the following procedures should be established and enforced:

(a) Particular care should be taken in the selection, training and supervision of those persons such as receptionists, switchboard operators, and information and referral personnel, who come into contact with those who seek the assistance of the hospital, to assure that they discharge their duties in an impartial and non-discriminatory manner.

(b) Instruction in the basic pronunciation of Spanish names should be given to all employees who have contact with the public.

(c) Bilingual posters should be posted advising all persons that it is hospital policy to administer its services in a non-discriminatory fashion, and that complaints of discrimination may be filed with either the hospital or the Colorado Civil Rights Commission.

(d) Spanish-speaking employees should be available to serve as interpreters when needed.

(e) A continuous and effective program of internal investigation should be carried out to assure that hospital employees do not engage in discriminatory practices.

3. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Psychological and other tests should be administered to all law enforcement personnel both for initial employment and for promotion, to aid in determining whether they are emotionally unstable, have violent tendencies, or have discriminatory attitudes and opinions which would make it impossible for them to discharge their official duties in an impartial and nondiscriminatory manner. Any applicant or officer failing to score satisfactorily on such tests should not be hired or promoted. Where, as in Denver, polygraph or "lie detector" tests are administered, questions regarding discriminatory attitudes and activities should be included in such tests.

Law enforcement agencies in communities which have a substantial proportion of minority citizens should make serious and concerted efforts to recruit minority group persons as law enforcement officers. Such efforts should include the development of "culture-fair" tests for admission, and a program to help prepare minority persons to take the admission tests. Members of the minority community cannot believe that law enforcement agencies are prepared to treat them in a nondiscriminatory fashion until it is clear that minority persons are extended equal opportunity in recruitment, assignment, and promotions within such law enforcement agencies.

Continuing professional education, with heavy emphasis not only on scientific police techniques but also on human relations subjects, due process of law, and equal protection of the laws, should be required of all law enforcement personnel, including the command levels. Such education should be afforded without cost to the officer as a part of his regular employment schedule, or with compensatory time off. (NOTE: In Denver, police officers are given two hours off for each month during which they score above 90 in target shooting. Certainly similar incentives could be offered to officers who demonstrate professional proficiency in areas such as those mentioned above.)

Rules and regulations should be established, posted, and enforced by all command personnel from the chief of police on down, requiring non-discriminatory conduct by law enforcement officers in the discharge of their official duties, and prohibiting discriminatory references, comments and actions in the presence of other law enforcement officers or members of the general public. As the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has correctly stated, "perhaps the single most potent weapon against unlawful police activity is a police commander who will not tolerate it."*

Refusal of officers to work with other officers on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry should be prohibited, and certainly not honored.

To the extent administratively possible, two-man police cars operating in minority areas should be "integrated" - i.e. should have one non-minority officer and one officer who is a member of the minority group which is predominant in the area.

A line position of "community relations officer" should be established and adequately staffed; the duties of officers

*Justice, 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report, Book 5, p.82.

holding this position should include continuing communication and contact with all significant elements of the community to which they are assigned.

An inspection bureau should be created within each law enforcement agency; this bureau should be under an officer of high rank who is responsible only to the head of the department. One of the chief duties of the inspection bureau should be to observe, at random and at unannounced times and places and in as inconspicuous a manner as possible, the conduct of other police officers on duty, and to report any improper conduct to the head of the department for appropriate personnel action, including disciplinary action when indicated. Such inspection activities are acknowledged to be an integral part of the operation of any good law enforcement agency having more than a minimal number of officers. (The charter of the City and County of Denver makes provision for up to six persons of division chief rank within the police department; an inspection bureau headed by an officer of that rank could be created without displacing any present division chief. This writer knows of no staff persons within the Denver Police Department presently discharging the "inspection" functions mentioned above.)

(NOTE: Not only with regard to matters involving racial discrimination, but also with regard to other aspects of their employment, Denver policemen were observed on numerous occasions to conduct themselves in a manner which indicates that their superiors either did not know or did not care what policemen did while on duty, or while off duty but in uniform.

Examples of such conduct include the following:

(a) On September 4, 1967, officers were observed to stop and search a Spanish-surnamed youth for narcotics; no narcotics were found, and the youth was released. One of the officers acknowledged to an investigator that the search had been improper and that the officer knew it to be improper. The officer further stated: "If I had found something on him I would have put him in jail for investigation, and when the District Attorney finally got around to saying we wouldn't prosecute it because the evidence was illegally seized then he would be released - but at least he has been kept on his toes". Illegal searches and arrests were frequently observed - and acknowledged by the officers to be illegal - during the course of this investigation.

(b) On August 18, 1967, police drove into a filling station solely for the purpose of receiving a free pack of cigarettes from the person in charge of the station; they accepted the free package of cigarettes from the attendant, and left immediately after receiving this gratuity. The officers involved acknowledged that this activity was a daily occurrence at this station for themselves and many other officers. The acceptance of small gratuities, such as cigarettes, and meals for half price, was observed to be an almost universal practice within the DPD.

(c) A policeman who sells life insurance to persons in the area in which he works was observed collecting an insurance premium while in uniform and on duty.

(d) On September 12, 1967, a uniformed police officer working an off duty job was observed "necking" with a young girl in a girls' residence hall.

(e) While on duty on September 7, 1967, two policemen were observed driving a dancer to various bars to help her obtain employment; thereafter, and while still on duty, the officers and the girl retired to her apartment for pizza; one officer then remained with her in her apartment with the lights out for about half an hour while the other officer waited outside in the police car.

(f) On September 4, 1967, the following was observed: two policemen, while on duty and in uniform and without being asked by anyone to do so, arranged with a prostitute to bestow her favors on an acquaintance of theirs without charge as a favor to them, and even determined when and where the prostitute and the man should meet; the meeting thus arranged subsequently did in fact take place, all within the sight of the policemen.

The foregoing clearly establishes the need for closer supervision and inspection of Denver police officers by higher-ranking members of the department and, in addition, the need for increased emphasis in police training upon an upgrading of professional attitudes and conduct. The same unawareness or indifference to proper police conduct indicated by the incidents above set forth carries over into police conduct in the area of racial discrimination. As a matter of fact, it is the opinion of this writer, based upon numerous conversations between Denver policemen and the investigators assisting in this study, that in many cases the identities of policemen who do express discriminatory attitudes and engage in discriminatory conduct are well known to their fellow officers and to their superiors, but that little or nothing is done to eliminate such discriminatory attitudes and conduct.)

A procedure should be established within each law enforcement agency for direct and impartial investigation, by superior officers, of all the civilian complaints against such agency, and for the taking of appropriate remedial action where an officer is found to have acted improperly. In all cases, a written reply to the complainant, explaining the disposition of the complaint, should be required.

4. GENERAL

An independent citizen complaint agency of the "ombudsman" type should be established for Colorado, and a similar agency should be established at the local level within the City and County of Denver. The agency should have the power to:

(a) Receive and investigate citizen complaints against actions of governmental agencies.

(b) Investigate governmental agency action on its own initiative.

(c) Subpoena witnesses and documents, and hold hearings.

(d) Make public reports and, where appropriate, criticize and publicize inappropriate government agency action.

(e) Recommend corrective changes in laws, regulations and procedures.

Immediate and serious consideration should be given to adoption of legislation as follows:

1. The Colorado Civil Rights Commission (hereinafter called "Commission") should have the power to receive, investigate and pass upon complaints, and to initiate and conduct its own studies and investigations of the existence, causes, character and extent of:

(a) Discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry by any person, group association or governmental entity within the State of Colorado.

(b) Racial, religious and ethnic group tensions, prejudice and intolerance, and any social disorder occasioned thereby.

(NOTE: In the area of housing practices, the Commission, under 69-7-4 or the Colorado Revised Statutes of 1963, as amended, presently has the power to initiate studies and investigations of the existence, character, causes and extent of discriminatory practices, and to formulate plans for the elimination of such discrimination by educational or other means.)

2. The Commission should have the power:

(a) To obtain and utilize the services of any governmental agency within the State of Colorado, and to inspect the records of any governmental agency, to the extent necessary to carry out its duties.

(b) To promote the creation of local commissions on human relations, and to cooperate or contract with individuals in state, local and other agencies, both public and private, including agencies of the federal government and of other states.

(c) To accept public grants, private gifts, bequests or other payments to be used in carrying out its statutory powers.

(d) To develop training programs in human relations and civil rights, and to present such programs upon request to agencies of state and local government and to private groups.

3. It should be a prohibited unfair discriminatory practice, subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, for any governmental agency within the state of Colorado to engage in discriminatory treatment of any person because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry.

4. It should be provided that any person who wilfully resists, prevents, impedes or interferes with the Commission or any of its members or representatives in the performance of its duties, or who wilfully violates an order of the Commission, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and punishable accordingly. (However, procedure for review of a Commission order should not be deemed to be such wilful conduct.)

5. Serious consideration should be given to a further, more extensive study of discrimination on the part of governmental agencies in Colorado.

CONCLUSION

Discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry does exist at the point of contact between minority group citizens and some of the governmental agencies investigated during this study. Sometimes the contacts observed were clear cases of intentional discrimination. On other occasions, while it cannot be said with certainty that there was an intent to discriminate, the result of the contact between the minority citizen and the particular governmental agency was clearly discriminatory - that is to say, the minority citizen was not treated as well as was a non-minority citizen in similar situations.

Some discriminatory conduct was observed within the Colorado Department of Employment and Denver General Hospital, but the greatest amount of discrimination observed during this study was that practiced by members of the Denver Police Department. This fact is emphasized by pointing out that all the police activities described in this report were observed during 258 man-hours of actual investigation, which is a very small percentage of the man-hours spent by Denver policemen on patrol during a given day.

Admittedly, the role of the policeman brings him into frequent contact with citizens in situations of anxiety, tension, hostility, and danger. However, the nature of the job requires that he react to similar situations in a similar fashion, without regard to the race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry of the persons involved. This investigation has revealed that a substantial number of policemen discharge their duties in a discriminatory fashion, and has disclosed a great need for further professionalization of law enforcement personnel and procedures at all levels within the Denver Police Department.

Discriminatory contacts between minority persons and governmental agencies must be eliminated. The recommendations made herein concerning the selection, training and supervision of governmental personnel, internal agency investigation, the establishment of independent citizen complaint agencies, and changes in laws and regulations, will do much to assure that all Colorado citizens are indeed equal in the treatment they receive from the agencies of their government.

SUGGESTED

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beral, Harold and Marcus Sisk. "Administration of Complaints by Civilians Against the Police,: 77 Harvard Law Review 499 (1964).

Bonfield, Arthur, "The Substance of American Fair Employment Practices Legislation II -- Employment Agencies, Labor Organizations, and Others," 62 Northwestern Law Review 19 (1967).

Coxe, Police Advisory Board, "The Philadelphia Story", 35 Conn. Bar Journal 138 (1961).

Curry, King and Jesse. Race Tensions and the Police. Baltimore, 1961.

Davis, "Ombudsmen in America," 109 Univ. of Penn. Law Review 1057 (1961).

Emerson, Thomas I., David Haber and Norman Dorsen. Political and Civil Rights in the United States. 2 vols. Boston, 1967.

Epstein, Charlotte. Intergroup Relations for Police Officers. Baltimore, 1962.

Grimshaw, Allen D. "Police Agencies and the Prevention of Racial Violence," 54 Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 110 (1963).

"Integration: What is Hospital's Role?" Hospitals (October 16, 1963), p. 17.

Justice, 1961 United States Commission on Civil Rights Report, Book 5.

Kephart, William M. Racial Factors and Urban Law Enforcement. Philadelphia, 1957.

Lohman, Joseph D. Police and Minority Groups. Chicago, 1947.

Morais. History of Discrimination in Medicine. Publishers Inc., Washington, D. C., 1967.

NAACP Annual Report for 1966. New York, 1966.

A National Survey of Police and Community Relations. A Report of a Research Study Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Field Surveys v. Washington, D. C., 1967.

The Police and the Community. 2 Vols. A Report of a Research Study Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Fields Surveys IV. Washington, D. C., 1966.

Report on New York City: Health Facilities. A Report by the New York State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Washington, D. C., 1964.

Report on a Pilot Study in the District of Columbia on Victimization and Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement. A Report of a Research Study Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Field Surveys I. Washington, D. C., 1967.

Rudwick, Elliot M. "Police Work and the Negro," 50 *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 596 (1959-60).

Samuels, Gertrude. "Who shall Judge a Policeman?" New York Times Magazine (August 2, 1964), 8, 34, and 46.

Schrotel, Stanley R. "Supervising the Use of Police Authority," 47 *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 589 (1956-57).

Skolnick, Jerome H. *Justice Without Trial: A Sociological Study of Law Enforcement*. New York, 1966.

Time, "Who Polices the Police?" 85:58, April 30, 1965.

"Working Rules for Assuring Non-Discrimination in Hospital Administration", 74 Yale Law Journal 151 (1964).

APPENDIX A

It has been pointed out that a time sampling procedure focusing on critical-incidents of discriminatory contacts was selected for use in Part II. A classification of the time spent observing the various agencies is presented on pages 30 and 31 of the report on Part II. A more detailed specification of the observations follows:

Five persons were employed in observing the Colorado Department of Employment. Their observation times and locales were:

Denver Office	Hours	Totals
Observer A	74	
Observer B	32	
Observer C	10	
Observer D	1	
Observer E	1	
	118	118
Offices outside of Denver		
Observer A	18	18

Observation of the Police Departments was carried out by 3 persons:

Denver	Hours	Totals
Observer A	252	
Observer B	4	
Observer E	2	
	258	258
Outside of Denver		
Observer A	27	27

Three persons were employed to make observations in the hospitals studied. Two of these are registered nurses and they provided information relative to those incidents which occurred in a medical setting. The remaining individual was a lay person who made observations in the waiting areas of the hospitals.

Denver	Hours	Totals
Observer E (RN)	220	
Observer F (RN)	69	
Observer G	90	
	379	379
Outside Denver		
Observer E (RN)	30	30
TOTAL		830 Hours

In order to illustrate the specifics of the observing procedure, the detailed breakdown of the 252 hours spent with the Denver Police Department by Observer A is given:

	No. of Hours
Observation of police while riding DGH ambulance	21
Observation of police in DGH emergency room	8
Observation of police at City Jail	3
Observation of police at DPD information desk, 13th and Champa	8
Observation of police at entry to County Court room, 13th and Champa	5
Observation of police at information desk, DPD District #3 Station	3
Observation of police at information desk, DPD District #4 Station	4
Observation of police at information desk, DPD District #2 Station	4
Observation of police in front of DPD Headquarters at 13th and Champa	4
	60

Observation of police by Observer A, from his car, using police radio monitor:	No. of Hours
Dahlia Shopping Center	8
General NE Denver Area	19
Down town Denver	8
Five Points Area	11
Lincoln Park Area	7
Bronco Football Game	3
"Hippie" establishment	3
	59
Observation while riding with policemen in police cars:	
Car A. Five Points - evening	8
Car A. Five Points - daytime	8
Car B. Five Points - downtown evening	8
Car B. Five Points - downtown daytime	16
Car C. South Denver - evening	8
Car D. North Denver - evening	8
Car E. Five Points - Northeast Denver, evening	8
Car F. Larimer Area - Evening	8
Car E. Cheesman Park Area - daytime	8
Car G. NE and Central Denver - evening	8
Car H. Lincoln Park Area - evening	13
Car I. Central Denver - evening	8
Car J. Downtown Denver - evening	8
Car K. North Denver - evening	8
Riding with a Division Chief, entire city, evening	8
	133
TOTAL HOURS	252

NOTE: With the exception of 1 officer in Car B, Observer A did not ride with any one officer on more than one occasion.

APPENDIX B

The premature release of Part II of this report occasioned considerable misunderstanding regarding the purposes and methodology employed by the Civil Rights Commission and its investigators. Many questions were raised that merit answers which were not immediately evident in the report itself. Interviews with the Commission people, members of the consulting committee and the investigators have often been selectively aired in the media. This Appendix is directed at answering the major queries posed.

The Civil Rights Commission, at the request of the consulting committee, undertook to collect all news articles, editorials and similar commentary from radio and television which related to this Report. In order to place some limits on this material, primarily Denver stations and Denver newspapers were reviewed. Except for a complete presentation of the report in the Denver Post, it became evident that much emotion and bias entered into the reporting. Despite the fact that both newspapers and radio and television reporters were informed that the report which gained the most attention was actually Part II of the study, no interest was manifested in the first part of the investigation, hence no material relating to this latter aspect of the research appeared in the media. In addition, though approximately one-third of the total time spent in the investigation for Part II concerned the Police, well over 90 percent of the writing and commentary that reached the public dealt with the Police. Because of this emphasis, the following remarks will be first directed at questions relative to the Police.

1. A few days before publicity was directed to this report, the then Chief of Police, Harold Dill, was dismissed from his position. Accusations were made that this was due to actions of minority groups in Denver. The Rocky Mountain News on December 1, 1967 quoted radio station KOA and KOA-TV as stating that the Civil Rights Commission Report was "the real reason Chief Dill may have been fired." To the best knowledge of members of the Civil Rights Commission and the Consulting Committee, no copy of the report or any information contained therein ever reached Mayor Currigan's office until after Chief Dill was discharged, (and well after the report received publicity, during which time the Mayor was out of the city.)

2. On December 10, 1967, a reporter of the Denver Post published an open letter to Mr. Frank Plaut, the director of the second phase of the overall investigation, and writer of the report. The reporter requested information regarding time spent with the same Police officers, hours spent in minority and Anglo areas, and other similar information about statistical considerations underlying that aspect of the investigation concerned

with the Police. Appendix A presents this information. This reporter also questioned the lack of information provided relative to nondiscriminatory contacts by the police. The Contract for the second phase of the study called for a determination as to whether discriminatory contacts existed between public officials and minority persons. This is also explicity stated in the report. The question is not that the majority of contacts were nondiscriminatory, but that discriminatory contacts should exist under any circumstances. Furthermore, it is of much more significanceto demonstrate the nature of such contacts by use of the expository procedure employed in the report than to depersonalize such with numerical counts. Some of these points have been explicated in the coordinating remarks between Parts I and II of this final report. Questions regarding bias and sampling raised by this reporter have also been answered in the coordinating material and appendices included in this overview of the entire project.

3. Questions have been raised also regarding the anonymity of the officers engaged in the various incidents reported. Chief Dill was first reported as requesting the names of all officers and, then, relative to certain specific incidents the Denver Post (December 15, 1967) noted that Chief Dill had identified the officers in question and talked to them. He

remarked that the officers gave a different version of the incidents in question than that provided by the investigator. It is interesting to note that the investigator provided such information when it reflected badly upon himself, -- not only upon the officers. If the investigator had been less forthright he should have been unwilling to have had such incidents publicized. This might lead to more credence being placed on the investigator's version of the incidents than that provided by the officers; this consideration seems to have been overlooked.

The furor raised over refusal of the Commission to release the names of the police and the apparent initial desire of the Police to know the names of the officers involved was apparently a specious issue.

First, the report provides in most instances the exact dates on which the troubling observations were made. The investigator filled out forms required by the police department to permit him to ride with the police in patrol cars. This was regularly done to fulfill the requirements of the Division of Administrative Services of the Denver Police Department. Such action is also in accordance with the City Attorney's office. Both of these sources have been further checked by the Commission, and it is known that the forms detailing the specific observation periods, car numbers and police personnel involved have been and may still be on file within the Police Department. Therefore the information requested by the Police Department was actually in its possession at all times.

The issue of anonymity was raised much earlier and resolved to the satisfaction of the Police Chief, the Manager of Safety and the Police Division Chiefs whose men were to be observed. This information was known to members of the Commission and the Consulting Committee prior to actual initiation of Phase 2 of the investigation. When information regarding this matter was again directed to Mr. Plaut, immediately following the premature release of the report, he replied in writing on January 3, 1968 as follows:

> At my request, and prior to our commencement of any investigation of officers of the Denver Police Department, a meeting was arranged at which Safety Manager Hugh McClearn, Chief of Police Harold Dill, Division Chief Jamerson, Division Chief Stanley, and myself were present. At this meeting, Mr. McClearn requested assurance that our investigative activity would not result in the filing of any suits on behalf of aggrieved citizens of any incident which I or my investigators observed during the course of the study. I assured both Mr. McClearn and Chief Dill that I would not undertake to represent any who might wish to assert such a claim. To give additional assurance that we were interested only in whether discrimination existed, and not in names, identities, or personalities, I assured both Mr. McClearn and Chief Dill that we would not report the names of any parties, either officers or civilians, whom we observed to be involved in any incident which we reported. This proposal was accepted and approved by Chief Dill and my report of our investigations was prepared in keeping with this undertaking.

4. Criticism has been directed at the inclusion of nondiscriminatory incidents in the report as being in violation of

both the intent and purpose of the study. It is implied that such information is not only irrelevant but motivated by malicious intentions on the part of the investigators and the Commission.

It should be noted that all such incidents and contacts are reported under the section titled, Recommendations, and that these observations are employed to buttress arguments for a variety of highly constructive changes within the Police Department, not only of the City of Denver, but for law enforcement agencies in general. These relate to improved methods of recruitment, assessment, and training of police officers; the recognition of and provision for opportunities of continuing professional education of these personnel; statement and enforcement of department rules and regulations which are either currently implicit or explicit within police codes; finally, for closer inspection and supervision of on and off duty relationships between command personnel and police officers and the community. The reader should also be aware of the fact that on page 50 or Part II of the report, there was specific note by the writer of the report as to why the nondiscriminatory contacts are included in the report.

It is evident from even a superficial review of the report of Part II of this report, that coverage by the media was generally done in a selective and biased manner. A disproportionate amount of attention was directed at the Police Department. It is hoped that a reduction in emotion will have occurred since the initial release of the report and attention turned to serious consideration of data offered and the recommendations made in the report.